

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected number of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2007/0140298A1 to ENG in view of Wolf et al (U.S. Patent 6,914,637 B1) and newly added reference U.S. Patent Application 2004/0114607 to Shay. In particular, the Examiner relies upon the Wolf reference in order to overcome the deficiencies of the ENG reference. More specifically at page 3 last paragraph,

“ENG does not disclose:

As regarding For claim 1,7,13 that the destination device is a display device, what kind of system the method is used or interspersing special characters and the main link to maintain synchronization ***such that neither the main link nor the auxiliary channel include a clock line...***” (emphasis added).

The Examiner goes on further to state on page 4 second paragraph,

“also note in column 2 Wolf in his definition of a DVI link expressively list the TMDS and DDC channel separately”.

In this way, the Examiner readily admits that Wolf is directed at DVI technology. In particular, the following is quoted directly from Wolf

A use of the TMDS serial link is the "Digital Visual Interface" interface ("DVI" link) adopted by the Digital Display Working Group. ***It will be described with reference to FIG. 1.*** A DVI link can be implemented to include two TMDS links (which share a common conductor pair for transmitting a video clock signal) or one TMDS link, as well as additional control lines between the transmitter and receiver. ***The DVI link of FIG. 1*** includes transmitter 1, receiver 3, and the following conductors between the transmitter and receiver: four conductor pairs...

Since both the TDMS link and the DDC link have clock lines (see Digital Visual Interface DVI Revision 1.0 April 2, 1999, Figure 2-1 page 10 and section 2.6 Signal List page 23), the Applicant believes that claims 1,7, and 13 as currently pending are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by ENG or Wolf or Shay taken singly or any combination since Wolf specifically requires a clock line as opposed to the invention recited above.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that claims 1, 7, and 13 and all claims depending thereon are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by any of the cited references taken separately or in any combination thereof.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001